/

Does the hierarchy problem generate the seesaw scale?

Ravi Kuchimanchi

arXiv:1401.5066v2 [hep-ph] 24 Apr 2014

Abstract

We find that minimizing the number of fine tuning relations in non-supersymmetric models can determine the scales at which some gauge symmetries beyond the standard model must break. We show that $SU(2)_R$ and $B-L$ gauge symmetries of the minimal left-right symmetric model must break at a scale $10^{15}GeV$ or higher, determined by the hierarchy problem and small ratios of quark masses, if parameters that break chiral or $\mu-$symmetries (and therefore can be naturally small), are not fine-tuned. This provides the *raison d'être* for the seesaw scale $\sim 10^{15}GeV$ indicated by neutrino experiments. Small ratios of fermion (quark) masses, which are natural in the standard model due to approximate chiral symmetry, will have to be fine tuned in minimal left right model if $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ breaks at a lower scale.

Keywords: `Hierarchy problem, fine tuning, left-right symmetry`
PACS: 12.10.Kt, 11.15.Ex, 11.30.Rd, 14.60.St

1. Introduction:

What we make of the hierarchy between the weak scale ($v_{wk} \sim 246GeV$) and the reduced Planck scale ($M_{Pl} \sim 2.4 \times 10^{18}GeV$), can determine where we expect the next scale of new physics to be. Note that radiative corrections to v_{wk}^2 of the order $h_t^2 M_{Pl}^2/(16\pi^2)$ (with top Yukawa coupling $h_t \sim 1$) would shift it towards the Planck scale unless there is fine tuning or a precise cancellation of such large terms to generate the small weak scale. This fine tuning of the standard model is the well known hierarchy problem [1, 2, 3].

In order to avoid fine tuning, new physics such as supersymmetry that solves the hierarchy problem was expected close to the weak scale. However despite direct and indirect searches, no hint for such new physics has been found. Thus the minimal supersymmetric standard model is now considered to be fine tuned to a 1% level or worse (see for example [4, 5, 6]). It appears that nature accepts fine tuning of gauge symmetry breaking scales and it is possible that there is no supersymmetry (or no SUSY till Planck scale).

*Corresponding author
Email address: `raviaravinda@gmail.com` (Ravi Kuchimanchi)

However there is some evidence for a new high energy scale in nature. The neutrino mass data [7] ($|\Delta m^2_{32}| = 0.0023eV^2$) points to a seesaw [8, 9, 10, 11] scale $M_{ss} = v^2_{wk}/\sqrt{|\Delta m^2_{32}|} \sim 1.3 \times 10^{15} GeV$. But what is the *raison d'être* for this scale?

The standard lore is that this is near where the weak, strong and electro-magnetic forces unify. However several grand unified theories (GUTs) are tightly constrained or ruled out. For example a recent paper [12] finds that only one chain of non-supersymmetric $SO(10)$ breaking is still consistent with data and that the constraint of unification of couplings determines the intermediate seesaw scale to be $\sim 10^{11} GeV$, with grand unification at $10^{16} GeV$. However the model suffers from a "very large level of fine-tuning" (quoting [12]) and "...the idea of an $SO(10)$ GUT is very appealing but all its practical realizations are clumsy, more so in the non SUSY case because of the hierarchy problem...." .

Historically the *extended survival hypothesis* [13, 14, 15] used in grand unified models such as [12] and other extensions of the standard model such as the left-right symmetric model [15], was motivated by the desire to minimize the number of fine tuning relations [14, 15]. The *hypothesis* however is to minimize the Higgs multiplets that are needed at lower and intermediate mass scales, rather than the number of fine tunings. It is implicitly assumed that by having the minimal Higgs content at lower scales, the number of fine tunings are automatically minimized [1]. However in practice since we do not keep track of the number of fine tunings, it may not always turn out to be minimal, and the theory becomes less predictive.

Therefore we ask, how many fine tuning constraints are actually necessary in non-supersymmetric theories to keep the scale of gauge symmetry breaking small? In the standard model $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ breaks to $U(1)_{em}$ requiring one Higgs vacuum expectation value (VEV) that is kept small by fine-tuning. If the standard model is extended to the left-right symmetric model based on $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, then we can first break $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ to $U(1)_Y$ at the scale $v_R \sim v_{B-L}$. In exact analogy with the standard model we expect that one fine-tuning relation is required to keep $v^2_R \ll M^2_{Pl}$. Therefore, totally we require two fine tunings for gauge scales in this model - one to ensure $v^2_R \ll M^2_{Pl}$ and the other to ensure $v^2_{wk} \ll M^2_{Pl}$.

In this letter we show that if we allow exactly two fine-tuning relations in the minimal left-right symmetric model, while $v^2_R \ll M^2_{Pl}$ is possible, v_R cannot be kept arbitrarily small and there is a meaningful lower bound $v_R \sim v_{B-L} \gtrsim 10^{15} GeV$. The reason for the bound is that a chiral $\mu-$symmetry is needed along with the two fine-tuning relations to obtain the correct symmetry breaking pattern. However the $\mu-$symmetry is approximately broken by small second generation Yukawa terms to obtain the proper quark mass spectrum. The hierarchy problem then reappears to destabilize the symmetry breaking pattern, but the quadratic divergence from the Planck scale is now suppressed by second generation Yukawas,

[1] Quoting from Dimopoulos and Georgi [14] "*3. The extended survival hypothesis.* If supersymmetry is not relevant (either absent completely or broken at the largest scale), we can still keep scalars light, but we need one fine tuning of parameters for each light scalar multiplet. Under these circumstances, we may want to keep the number of light scalars and therefore the number of independent fine tunings to the absolute minimum necessary."

leading to a scale of $10^{15}GeV$ for $v_R \sim v_{B-L}$. Breaking of $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ triggers the seesaw mechanism, and the see-saw scale $\sim 10^{15}GeV$ hinted at by neutrino mass data is thus generated by the hierarchy problem.

Thus without using any grand unification constraints, we can obtain meaningful bounds on gauge symmetry breaking scales and a *raison d'être* for the seesaw scale. The idea of minimizing the number of fine-tunings and using the hierarchy problem and chiral symmetries to provide limits on gauge symmetry breaking scales can be generalized to other groups.

2. Hierarchy problem in left-right model

We consider the minimal Left-Right symmetric model [16, 17, 18] based on $G_{LR} \equiv SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$, with the minimal number of scalar fields needed to break the gauge symmetries, namely triplets Δ_R (1, 1, 3, 2) and Δ_L (1, 3, 1, 2), and bi-doublet ϕ (1, 2, 2, 0). Note that Δ_L is needed since there is a space-inversion or parity (P) symmetry under which, as is usual in left-right symmetric (LR) models, the space-time coordinates $(x,t) \to (-x,t)$, $\phi \to \phi^\dagger$ and subscripts $L \leftrightarrow R$ for all other fields (see for example [19]). The scalar fields have the form

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^o & \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_1^- & \phi_2^o \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta_{L,R} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} & \delta_{L,R}^{++} \\ \delta_{L,R}^o & -\delta_{L,R}^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

The VEV $\langle \delta_R^o \rangle$ breaks $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ to $U(1)_Y$, while $\left\langle \phi_{1,2}^o \right\rangle$ cause electro-weak symmetry breaking, and $\langle \delta_L^o \rangle$ is a much smaller induced VEV. We designate these by

$$\langle \delta_R^o \rangle = \frac{v_R}{\sqrt{2}}, \ \langle \phi_1^o \rangle = \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{2}}, \ \langle \phi_2^o \rangle = \frac{k_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \ \langle \delta_L^o \rangle = \frac{v_L}{\sqrt{2}} \tag{2}$$

with $v_{wk}^2 = |k_1|^2 + |k_2|^2$ and study the fine-tuning implications to obtain the hierarchy $v_{wk}^2 << v_R^2 << M_{Pl}^2$, where the cut-off scale of the theory is taken to be M_{Pl}. Note that the fine tuning of the weak scale from v_R scale in left-right models was discussed in [20]. Likewise fine tuning of the weak scale in the standard model from the seesaw scale was discussed in [21, 22]. However fine tuning issues of weak and v_R scales due to quadratically divergent radiative corrections from a cut-off scale (such as M_{Pl}) much greater than v_R or seesaw scale were not previously studied.

To simplify calculations, without loss of generality, we take all VEVs to be real. In fact all parameters of the Higgs potential are real due to parity, except for one that is discussed in the comments at the end.

Relevant Higgs potential terms (using standard notation, see for example [19, 20]) that involve only Δ_R are

$$-\mu_3^2 Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R) + \rho_1 [Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R)]^2 + \rho_2 [Tr(\Delta_R \Delta_R) Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R^\dagger)] \tag{3}$$

Substituting for the VEV v_R from equations (2) and (1), and ignoring coupling terms with ϕ, the above potential can be minimized (for $\mu_3^2, \rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$) to give $v_R^2 = \mu_3^2/\rho_1$ Since μ_3^2

receives radiative correction of the order M_{Pl}^2 owing to the hierarchy problem, it is understood that it has been fine tuned to cancel these corrections, so that v_R^2 can be much less than M_{Pl}^2. This fine tuning cannot be avoided in non-supersymmetric models

We impose a chiral $\mu-$symmetry under which $\phi \to e^{i\beta}\phi$ and Δ_R is invariant (we provide transformations of other fields when they appear later), and write the terms involving ϕ (but ignore terms involving Δ_L until later) in the Higgs potential responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mu_1^2 Tr(\phi^\dagger\phi) + \lambda_1[Tr(\phi^\dagger\phi)]^2 + \lambda_3 Tr(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger\phi)Tr(\tilde{\phi}\phi^\dagger) + \\ \alpha_1 Tr(\phi^\dagger\phi)Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger\Delta_R) + \alpha_3 Tr(\phi^\dagger\phi\Delta_R\Delta_R^\dagger) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\tilde{\phi} = \tau_2\phi^\star\tau_2$. As we shall see later, the $\mu-$symmetry is needed to obtain the correct symmetry breaking pattern to the standard model. Substituting for the VEVs from equation (2) we can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} \left(-\mu_1^2 + \frac{\alpha_1}{2}v_R^2\right)\frac{k_1^2}{2} + \left(-\mu_1^2 + \frac{\alpha_1}{2}v_R^2 + \frac{\alpha_3}{2}v_R^2\right)\frac{k_2^2}{2} + \\ \frac{\lambda_1}{4}\left(k_1^4 + k_2^4\right) + \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{2} + \lambda_3\right)k_1^2k_2^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

It is easy to see that if μ_1^2 is fine tuned so that the quantity in the brackets of the first term of equation (5) is of the order of the $-v_{wk}^2$, minimization with respect to k_2 and k_1 leads to $k_2 = 0$ and $v_{wk} \approx \ k_1 = \sqrt{(\mu_1^2 - \alpha_1 v_R^2/2)/\lambda_1}$. This is the usual fine tuning that needs to be done to keep the weak scale small.

Note that we have assumed $\alpha_3 > 0$ and the quantity in brackets of second term of eq. (5) can be rewritten as $(\alpha_3/2)v_R^2 + O(v_{wk}^2) \sim (\alpha_3/2)v_R^2$. This implies that the second Higgs doublet (that is fields with subscript 2 in matrix representing bidoublet ϕ in equation (1)) has a mass $m_{H_2} = \left(\sqrt{\alpha_3/2}\right)v_R$.

We can in principle provide a small VEV to k_2 without any more fine tuning by breaking the $\mu-$symmetry softly using the term,

$$V_{break} = -\mu_2^2 Tr(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger\phi) + h.c. \tag{6}$$

This term adds $-2\mu_2^2 k_1 k_2$ to equation (5). Minimizing with respect to k_2 now gives to the lowest order

$$k_2 = \left[\frac{4\mu_2^2}{\alpha_3 v_R^2}\right]k_1 \tag{7}$$

Ignoring the quantity in brackets of the first term of (5) that has been fine tuned to be at weak scale, note that $|\mu_2^2| < \alpha_3 v_R^2/8$ must be satisfied to get the right symmetry breaking pattern. Otherwise due to the μ_2^2 term, there will be a saddle point either in the $k_2 = k_1$ or $k_2 = -k_1$ direction (depending on the sign of μ_2^2), that can provide VEVs $\gtrsim v_R$ to k_1 and k_2, breaking G_{LR} to $U(1)_{I_{3L+3R}} \times U(1)_{B-L}$ rather than to standard model. Since we are not allowing any more fine tunings, the only way for $|\mu_2^2|$ to be smaller than $\alpha_3 v_R^2/8$ is to impose the $\mu-$symmetry, like we have done.

As long as the $\mu-$symmetry breaking is soft, μ_2^2 does not receive quadratically divergent radiative correction from the Planck scale and can be naturally small. However the $\mu-$symmetric Yukawa terms (with $\{Q_{iL}, \phi\} \rightarrow e^{i\beta}\{Q_{iL}, \phi\}$ and Q_{iR} invariant under $\mu-$symmetry) which provide masses to quarks are of the form

$$\sum_{i,j=1,3} h_{ij}\bar{Q}_{iL}\phi Q_{jR} + h.c. \tag{8}$$

where $Q_{iL} \equiv (u_{iL}, d_{iL})^T$ and $Q_{iR} \equiv (u_{iR}, d_{iR})^T$ are the left and right handed Quark doublets of the i^{th} generation and are represented by 2×1 column vectors in iso-space. Substituting for the VEVs of ϕ we can see that the up and down quark mass matrices are proportional to each other. Therefore they can be simultaneously diagonalized and hereafter we work in the basis where h_{ij} is diagonal. We can now obtain the quark masses in terms of the Yukawas. Writing these explicitly we get,

$$\frac{h_{33}k_1}{\sqrt{2}} = m_t,\ \frac{h_{33}k_2}{\sqrt{2}} = m_b,\ \frac{h_{22}k_1}{\sqrt{2}} = m_c \tag{9}$$

From the above we obtain $k_2/k_1 = m_b/m_t$. It is useful to note here that the smallness of bottom to top quark mass ratio is natural in the standard model due to its approximate chiral symmetries that make small fermion Yukawa couplings like $h_b << h_t \sim 1$ of bottom quark natural. However in the LR model the same Yukawa coupling h_{33} of equation (8) provides both the top and bottom quarks their masses, and it is the chiral $\mu-$symmetry which keeps μ_2^2 naturally small, that through equation (7) makes smallness of k_2/k_1 and therefore of m_b/m_t natural. If we allow fine tuning of μ_2^2 we will lose the naturalness of small fermion mass ratios like m_b/m_t in the LR model.

However the mass of the strange quark turns out to be too low, $m_s = h_{22}k_2/\sqrt{2} = (m_b/m_t)m_c$. Also the Cabibo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixing angles vanish. Therefore we must allow for approximate breaking of the $\mu-$symmetry by Yukawa terms of the kind

$$\tilde{h}_{22}\bar{Q}_{2L}\tilde{\phi}Q_{2R} + \tilde{h}_{23}\bar{Q}_{2L}\tilde{\phi}Q_{3R} + \tilde{h}_{23}^{\star}\bar{Q}_{3L}\tilde{\phi}Q_{2R} + h.c. + ... \tag{10}$$

so that we now have

$$m_s \approx \frac{\tilde{h}_{22}k_1}{\sqrt{2}},\ V_{ts} \approx \frac{\tilde{h}_{23}k_1}{\sqrt{2}m_b} \tag{11}$$

Note that the occurrence of $\tilde{h}_{23}^{\star}(= \tilde{h}_{32})$ in equation (10) is because Yukawa matrices involving the bi-doublet are Hermitian due to parity, as is well known in left-right symmetric models [19].

Since $\mu-$symmetry is approximately broken by Yukawa terms, μ_2^2 receives a quadratically divergent radiative contribution at 1-loop level from diagrams involving the second generation such as the one in Figure 1.

We evaluate such diagrams by providing a cut-off at the reduced Planck scale and find the radiative correction at one-loop level,

$$\mu_2^{2(rad)} \sim \left(\frac{6}{2}\right)\left[\frac{M_{Pl}^2}{16\pi^2}\right] h_{22}\tilde{h}_{22} \tag{12}$$



Figure 1: Quadratically divergent radiative contribution to μ_2^2 from approximate breaking of $\mu-$symmetry. ϕ_1^o and ϕ_2^o are neutral components of ϕ and are given in equation (1)

The factor of 6 in the first numerator is to account for the 3 colors of the strange quark, and because there is also an equal contribution from a similar diagram with the charm quark in the loop (with h_{22} and $\tilde{h}_{22}$ interchanged). The 2 in the denominator accounts for the trace in eq. (6).

Since

$$\mu_2^2 = \mu_2^{2(bare)} + \mu_2^{2(rad)}, \tag{13}$$

if we do not allow fine tuning of equation (13), so that there is no precise cancellation between the bare and radiative terms, we obtain the bound

$$\left|\mu_2^2\right| \gtrsim \left|\mu_2^{2(rad)}\right| \tag{14}$$

This bound on μ_2^2 translates to a bound on v_R^2 through equation (7). Combining equations (14), (12) and (7), and using (9) and (11) to express the Yukawas in terms of quark masses (with $k_1 \approx v_{wk}$), we get the following lower bound on v_R

$$v_R \sim v_{B-L} \gtrsim \left[\frac{M_{Pl}}{2\pi}\right]\left[\sqrt{\frac{6m_s m_c}{\alpha_3 m_b m_t}}\right]\left[\frac{m_t}{v_{wk}}\right] \tag{15}$$

Several papers have results on the running Yukawa couplings in the standard model. We use the results of Das and Parida [23] (updated recently in [24]) for the quark masses in the standard model evaluated at a scale of $2 \times 10^{16} GeV$ to evaluate the above. From their work we have at the high scale, $m_s = 20.4 MeV, m_c = 0.22 GeV, m_b = 0.93 GeV, m_t = 70.5 GeV$ and $v_{wk} = 155 GeV\sqrt{2} \approx 219 GeV$.

Substituting in (15), we get the bound

$$\sqrt{\alpha_3} v_R \gtrsim 1.04 \times 10^{-3} M_{Pl} \sim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV. \tag{16}$$

where we used $M_{Pl} = 2.4 \times 10^{18} GeV$. Note that the left hand side of (16) is $\sqrt{2}$ times the mass of the second Higgs doublet. Since we expect in the perturbative regime, $\alpha_3 \lesssim 1$, equation (16) evaluated with $\alpha_3 = 1$ also provides a lower bound on v_R. That is $v_R \gtrsim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV$.

Note that instead of the scale $2 \times 10^{16} GeV$, if we use the Yukawa couplings evaluated at the scale $10 TeV$ (from a recent paper by Antusch and Maurer [25]), we get $\sqrt{\alpha_3} v_R \geq$

$1.8 \times 10^{-3} M_{Pl}$. This shows that the scale or the method used to evaluate the Yukawas does not make much of a difference to the bound.

The dots in equation (10) represent other terms that approximately violate $\mu-$symmetry, that can potentially be there. However for the purposes of our lower bound calculation, the strength of their couplings can be neglected without resorting to fine-tuning. For example the term $\tilde{h}_{33}\bar{Q}_L\tilde{\phi}Q_R$, can be radiatively generated at one-loop with the strength (up to logarithmic factors) $\tilde{h}_{33}^{rad} \sim [1/(16\pi^2)](\tilde{h}_{32}\tilde{h}_{22}\tilde{h}_{23}) \sim 10^{-13}$. Since h_{ij} is diagonal there is no contribution to $\tilde{h}_{33}^{rad}$ from the combination of Yukawas ($h_{33}\tilde{h}_{32}h_{23}$). Therefore we can choose $\tilde{h}_{33} \lesssim h_{22}\tilde{h}_{22}$ without fine tuning, so that its contribution to $\mu_2^{2(rad)}$ is at most of the same order of magnitude as already present in equation (12).

3. Seesaw scale

The bound value $v_R \sim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV$ we obtained is close to the seesaw scale hinted by neutrino experiments namely $M_{ss} \sim v_{wk}^2/\sqrt{|\Delta m_{23}^2|} \sim 1.3 \times 10^{15} GeV$, which suggests that the seesaw scale is determined by the hierarchy problem and small quark mass ratios. Since we have imposed an approximate $\mu-$symmetry, we will now verify that the terms necessary for seesaw mechanism are not suppressed.

As before under $\mu-$symmetry, $\{\phi, Q_{iL}, L_{iL}\} \rightarrow e^{i\beta}\{\phi, Q_{iL}, L_{iL}\}$, and $\Delta_L \rightarrow e^{-2i\beta}\Delta_L$, with Δ_R, Q_{iR} and L_{iR} being invariant. There is only one P and $\mu-$symmetric quartic term in the Higgs potential that contains all three fields (as before, we use the standard notation in [19, 20]),

$$\beta_2 \left[Tr\left(\tilde{\phi}\Delta_R\phi^\dagger\Delta_L^\dagger\right) + Tr\left(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger\Delta_L\phi\Delta_R^\dagger\right)\right]. \tag{17}$$

The remaining $\mu-$symmetric terms containing Δ_L relevant for providing it a VEV are

$$-\mu_3^2 Tr(\Delta_L\Delta_L^\dagger) + \rho_3 Tr(\Delta_L\Delta_L^\dagger)Tr(\Delta_R\Delta_R^\dagger) \tag{18}$$

Rewriting the Higgs potential in terms of the VEVs using equation (2), recalling that $v_R^2 = \mu_3^2/\rho_1$, and minimizing with respect to v_L we get, $v_L \sim (\beta_2/[\rho_3 - 2\rho_1])(v_{wk}^2/v_R)$, with $\rho_3 > 2\rho_1 > 0$.

Noting that the usual Yukawa terms that give rise to Majorana masses $f_{ij}L_{iL}^T\tau_2\Delta_L L_{jL} + h.c.$ (and terms with subscript $L \rightarrow R$), are permitted by $\mu-$symmetry we find that v_L contributes to the largest light neutrino mass m_i^ν

$$m_i^\nu \sim \sqrt{2} f_{ii} v_L \sim \sqrt{2}\left[\frac{f_{ii}\beta_2}{(\rho_3 - 2\rho_1)}\right]\left(\frac{v_{wk}^2}{v_R}\right) \tag{19}$$

with $i = 3$ (or $i = 2$) depending on whether it is normal (or inverted) hierarchy. Substituting our bound value, $v_R \sim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV$ and $v_{wk} \sim 246 GeV$, we see that if the quantity in the square brackets has a natural value around 1.4 for $i = 3$ (or $i = 2$), we obtain the observed $|m_3^{\nu 2} - m_2^{\nu 2}| \sim |\Delta m_{32}^2| \sim 0.0023 eV^2$. With $v_R \sim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV$, the full seesaw mechanism can proceed either as Type II [26, 27, 28] or Type I [8, 9, 10, 11] seesaw, or a hybrid of the two.

4. A few comments

- If the hierarchy problem is solved by supersymmetry or another mechanism at a scale Λ, then M_{Pl} in equations such as (12) and (15) will be replaced by Λ.

- The lower end of the bound in equation (15), that is $v_R \sim 2.5 \times 10^{15} GeV$, corresponds to the minimum violation of $\mu-$symmetry needed to obtain the correct quark mass spectrum. It also corresponds to not introducing an additional scale through the term $\mu_2^2 Tr(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \phi)$ – that is if $\mu_2^{2(bare)} = 0$ in equation (13) then only the radiative correction $\mu_2^{2(rad)}$ determines $\sqrt{\alpha_3} v_R$ to be at the lower end of the bound.

- If we add a second bi-doublet ϕ', without any additional fine tuning, its mass will naturally be of the order $M_{\phi'} \gtrsim M_{Pl}/(4\pi)$. Though with two bi-doublets the $\mu-$symmetry can be broken only softly, the soft symmetry breaking mass term involving ϕ' such as $Tr\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \phi'$ must be at a large scale $\sim (m_s/m_t) M_{\phi'}^2$ in order to obtain the needed VEVs for ϕ'. Thus the $\mu-$symmetry is once again broken at a large scale, which in turn radiatively generates the μ_2^2 term of first bi-doublet ϕ and results in a significant lower bound on v_R as before. Depending on choice of parameters, the exact bound value will change. The effective theory below $M_{\phi'}$ is the minimal model.

- α_2, the only complex parameter in the Higgs potential of the left-right symmetric model (see for example [19]) is naturally small, since the term $\alpha_2 Tr(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \phi) Tr(\Delta_R^\dagger \Delta_R)$ (with its parity counterpart) breaks $\mu-$ symmetry. Thus this term is under control for the purposes of our calculation. Choosing a natural value for $\mu-$breaking parameter $|\alpha_2| \lesssim h_{22} \tilde{h}_{22}$, it can be consistently ignored in our calculation. However in LR models it is the source of the strong CP problem, which can be solved without requiring an axion as shown in [29, 30]. If a family of vectorlike quarks needed for the strong CP solution are at the Planck scale, the theory below it is our minimal left-right model. The predictions of this ultra-violet completion are a measurable strong CP phase (neutron electric dipole moment (EDM)) that is radiatively generated in a large region of the parameter space, no electron EDM due to the high scale of new physics; and in the minimal version an absence of all leptonic CP phases [30, 31]. If $v_R \sim 10^{15} GeV$ is the next scale of new physics then these predictions maybe the only window for more evidence on left-right symmetry.

5. Conclusion

In non supersymmetric theories fine-tuning of gauge symmetry breaking scales is necessary. By imposing a very reasonable condition that only VEVs that are actually needed to break gauge symmetries are fine tuned, while any additional parameters including those that break chiral or $\mu-$symmetries are not fine tuned, we have shown that we can obtain meaningful lower bounds on some gauge symmetry breaking scales. In the absence of unnecessary fine tuning, we may need chiral symmetries to ensure that higher gauge symmetries break to the standard model rather than to some other group. These chiral symmetries are

however broken by fermion (quark) mass ratios. The hierarchy problem then reappears to destabilize the symmetry breaking pattern, but is suppressed from the reduced Planck scale by small quark mass ratios that break certain chiral or $\mu-$symmetries. Since we do not allow an additional fine tuning relation, we can obtain a lower bound on where some gauge symmetries are broken.

In particular we find that the $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking scale in minimal left right symmetric model, $v_{B-L} \sim v_R \gtrsim 10^{15} GeV$ if there is no fine tuning of parameters that break chiral or $\mu-$symmetry. Since $B-L$ breaking triggers the seesaw mechanism, it leads to the understanding of seesaw scale $\sim 10^{15} GeV$ indicated by neutrino experiments, without need for grand unification constraints.

Our bound can be violated in the minimal left-right symmetric model if there is an additional fine tuning relation involving parameters that break chiral symmetries – apart from the fact that this is theoretically unattractive, it should be noted that in this case, the smallness of some fermion mass ratios such as m_b/m_t that is natural in the standard model, would no longer be natural in the left-right symmetric model.

References

[1] E. Gildener, Gauge-symmetry hierarchies, Phys. Rev. D 14 (1976) 1667–1672. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.1667.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.14.1667

[2] S. Weinberg, Implications of dynamical symmetry breaking: An addendum, Phys. Rev. D 19 (1979) 1277–1280. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.19.1277.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.19.1277

[3] L. Susskind, Dynamics of spontaneous symmetry breaking in the weinberg-salam theory, Phys. Rev. D 20 (1979) 2619–2625. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.20.2619.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.20.2619

[4] A. Arvanitaki, M. Baryakhtar, X. Huang, K. Van Tilburg, G. Villadoro, The Last Vestiges of NaturalnessarXiv:1309.3568.

[5] E. Bertuzzo, SUSY after LHC8: a brief overview, EPJ Web Conf. 60 (2013) 18001. arXiv:1307.0318, doi:10.1051/epjconf/20136018001.

[6] I. Antoniadis, Theory and phenomenology of physics with extra dimensions, IXth Rencontres du Vietnam: Windows on the Universe, Quy Nhon Vietnam.
URL http://vietnam.in2p3.fr/2013/Inauguration/transparencies/Antoniadis.pdf

[7] J. Beringer, et al., Review of Particle Physics (RPP), Phys.Rev. D86 (2012) 010001. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001.

[8] P. Minkowski, mu e gamma at a Rate of One Out of 1-Billion Muon Decays?, Phys.Lett. B67 (1977) 421. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(77)90435-X.

[9] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, R. Slansky, Supergravity, ed. by D. Freedman and P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, North Holland, Amsterdam, 315-321, 1979.
URL http://books.google.co.in/books?id=Dg-CAAAAIAAJ

[10] T. Yanagida, Horizontal symmetry and masses of neutrinos, Progress of Theoretical Physics 64 (3) (1980) 1103–1105. doi:10.1143/PTP.64.1103.

[11] R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanovic, Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Violation, Phys.Rev.Lett. 44 (1980) 912. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.44.912.

[12] G. Altarelli, D. Meloni, A non supersymmetric SO(10) grand unified model for all the physics below $M_(GUT)$, JHEP 1308 (2013) 021. arXiv:1305.1001, doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2013)021.

[13] F. del Aguila, L. E. Ibanez, Higgs Bosons in SO(10) and Partial Unification, Nucl.Phys. B177 (1981) 60. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90266-2.
[14] S. Dimopoulos, H. Georgi, Extended Survival Hypothesis and Fermion Masses, Phys.Lett. B140 (1984) 67. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)91049-9.
[15] R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanović, Higgs-boson effects in grand unified theories, Phys. Rev. D 27 (1983) 1601–1612. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.27.1601.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.27.1601
[16] J. C. Pati, A. Salam, Lepton number as the fourth "color", Phys. Rev. D 10 (1) (1974) 275–289. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.10.275.
[17] R. N. Mohapatra, J. C. Pati, Left-right gauge symmetry and an "isoconjugate" model of *cp* violation, Phys. Rev. D 11 (3) (1975) 566–571. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.566.
[18] G. Senjanovic, R. N. Mohapatra, Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity, Phys. Rev. D12 (1975) 1502. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.12.1502.
[19] P. Duka, J. Gluza, M. Zralek, Quantization and renormalization of the manifest left- right symmetric model of electroweak interactions, Annals Phys. 280 (2000) 336–408. arXiv:hep-ph/9910279, doi:10.1006/aphy.1999.5988.
[20] G. Barenboim, M. Gorbahn, U. Nierste, M. Raidal, Higgs sector of the minimal left-right symmetric model, Phys. Rev. D 65 (2002) 095003. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.65.095003.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.65.095003
[21] F. Vissani, Do experiments suggest a hierarchy problem?, Phys.Rev. D57 (1998) 7027–7030. arXiv:hep-ph/9709409, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.57.7027.
[22] J. Casas, J. Espinosa, I. Hidalgo, Implications for new physics from fine-tuning arguments. 1. Application to SUSY and seesaw cases, JHEP 0411 (2004) 057. arXiv:hep-ph/0410298, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/11/057.
[23] C. Das, M. Parida, New formulas and predictions for running fermion masses at higher scales in SM, 2 HDM, and MSSM, Eur.Phys.J. C20 (2001) 121–137. arXiv:hep-ph/0010004, doi:10.1007/s100520100628.
[24] K. Bora, Updated values of running quark and lepton masses at GUT scale in SM, 2HDM and MSSMarXiv:1206.5909.
[25] S. Antusch, V. Maurer, Running quark and lepton parameters at various scales, JHEP 1311 (2013) 115. arXiv:1306.6879, doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2013)115.
[26] M. Magg, C. Wetterich, Phys.Lett. B94 (1980) 61.
[27] G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi, C. Wetterich, Proton Lifetime and Fermion Masses in an SO(10) Model, Nucl.Phys. B181 (1981) 287–300. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(81)90354-0.
[28] R. N. Mohapatra, G. Senjanović, Neutrino masses and mixings in gauge models with spontaneous parity violation, Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 165–180. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.23.165.
URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.23.165
[29] R. Kuchimanchi, P/CP Conserving CP/P Violation Solves Strong CP Problem, Phys. Rev. D82 (2010) 116008. arXiv:1009.5961, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.116008.
[30] R. Kuchimanchi, Maximal CP and Bounds on the Neutron Electric Dipole Moment from P and CP Breaking, Phys.Rev. D86 (2012) 036002. arXiv:1203.2772, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.036002.
[31] R. Kuchimanchi, P stabilizes dark matter and with cp can predict leptonic phases, Eur. Phys. J. C 74 (2) (2014) 1–10. arXiv:1209.3031, doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2726-5.
URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2726-5